This is a response to the Office Action dated December 31, 2007. In this Office Action, all presently pending claims are rejected as unpatentable over Kikinis et al., (USP 6,336,137) (hereafter, "Kikinis").

## Interview with Examiner

On March 24, 2008, prior to filing a response that resulted in the instant office action, Applicant had a personal interview with Examiner Coulter. During the interview Applicant and Examiner Coulter discussed <u>Kikinis</u> as being relevant. After Applicant presented his arguments distinguishing <u>Kikinis</u> from the instantly claimed invention, Examiner Coulter stated in a Form PTOL-413:

> Identification of prior art discussed: *Kikinis (U.S. Pat. No. 6,076,109); Gershman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,099); Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,336,137).* * * * Examiner agreed that Kikinis and Gershman appear to not disclose the new proposed claim language.

Emphasis added. To recapitulate the discussion, applicant presented argument that <u>Kikinis</u> necessarily required a NanoBrowser on the client device, whereas the instantly claimed invention does not require using any browser (regular browser or NanoBrowser) on the client device. In light of this difference, Examiner is respectfully requested to review the rejection.

On July 18, 2008, Applicant had a telephone interview with Examiner Coulter in which Applicant presented the same arguments and highlighted the key differences between the architecture of <u>Kikinis</u> and instantly pending Claim 1. Applicant and his attorney are thankful for the courtesies shown by the Examiner in preparation of and during the interview. In particular, Applicant has pointed out that the following clause in claim 1, which recites,

> whereby the computer-executable instructions when
> executed by the central processor unit, cause the
> client computer (a) to transmit user input to the
> at least one of said one or more server
> computers, **on which server computer is executed a
> client-side application program**, and (b) to
> receive from the server computer **screen updates
> of user interface logic of the client-side
> application program via a remote display
> protocol**, thereby allowing **graphical display to
> be virtualized and served across the wireless
> network** to the client computer without the need
> for a virtual execution environment on the client
> computer.

(emphasis added) reciting that the client-side application program is executed on

the server computer; that the screen updates of user interface logic of the client-side

application program are received at the client computer from the server computer via a

remote display protocol, and that the graphical display is virtualized and served across the

wireless network, are not present in <u>Kikinis</u>. All independent claims as presented for

examination in the instant application do not require a browser on the client device. For

example, independent claim 16 recites in part the following language:

> second component coupled to the memory
> device, said second component configured to
> receive **a compound request message from the
> server wherein the compound request message
> comprises a plurality of events generated in a
> predetermined time period;**
> third component coupled to the memory
> device, said third component configured to **use
> the compound request message to update a display
> state of the client computer;** and
> a display device coupled to the central
> processor unit,
> wherein said client computer device is
> adapted to act as a **remote output device for at
> least one client-side application program running
> on at least one of said remotely located server
> computers over a wide-area mobile network without**

```
            the  need  for  an  execution  environment  on  the
            client computer.
```
(Emphasis added). The highlighted components, i.e., compound request message

used to update the display state of the client computer, and the client computer adapted to

act as a remote output device for a client-side application program running on the server

computer, are not present in Kikinis or any other cited references. In relevant part,

independent claim 30 recites:

```
            establishing a session between the client
    computer and the server computer, said client and
    server computer being connected using a wireless
    network;
            exchanging client capability information
    with the server computer;
            executing a client-side application program
    on the server computer;
            receiving,  at  the  client  computer,  user
    input for the client-side application program;
            transmitting,  to  the  server  computer,  user
    input  received  at  the  client  computer  for
    interpretation  by  the  client-side  application
    program running on the server computer; and
            receiving,  at  the  client  computer,  updates
    of user interface of the client-side application
    program from  the  server  computer,  via  a—remote
    display protocol
            thereby  allowing  user  interface  to  be
    virtualized  and  served  across  the  wireless
    network to the client computer.
```

(Emphasis added) The highlighted features are believed to patentably distinguish

<u>Kikinis</u> from the instantly presented independent claims. After the discussion, no

agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims.

<div align="center">Rejection of Claims</div>

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the following language

from Kikinis, disclosed at Col. 12, lines 14-20:

> An advantage inherent in different embodiments of the present invention is that future improvements in HTML, specific WEB browsing applications, and helper applications need not be installed on the field units used in practicing the invention. Such improvements need only be made in the Proxy-Server. The Proxy-Server can also be updated to do the best translation possible for such improvements.

Thus, it is clear that <u>Kikinis</u> needs a NanoBrowser in order to work. Nowhere in the cited language does <u>Kikinis</u> disclaim the need for a browser on the client device. The Office Action cited the following from <u>Kikinis</u>:

> At step 811 the control routines of the enhanced server begin to create the best fit in multimedia content for the requested data according to the user's device capabilities and characteristics. This process includes step 820 wherein the system of the invention determines if a best fit is immediately available. If so, control goes on to step 812. If not, in a preferred embodiment a best fit is generated and stored at step 821, and then control passes on the step 812. In step 821 a graphic is created having the size and resolution of the requesting user's display, and that picture is stored for future use. If the same user or a user having a device with the same display characteristics later requests this picture, it may be retrieved and sent immediately without the need for generating the best fit.

> At step 812 a single file is composed using the requested information processed according to the best multimedia fit for the user's device. That file is then transmitted to the user at step 813. Just as described above for other embodiments of the present invention the file transmitted to the user is attuned exactly to the user's needs, and may be directly displayed without heavy software overhead at the user's device, thereby enabling the user to maintain a minimally-configured and powered device.

The Office Action focused on the language "minimally-configured and powered device" to imply something that is not apparent. <u>Kikinis</u> clearly requires a NanoBrowser which distinguishes the independent claim above from <u>Kikinis</u>.

> Computer 13 through execution of a program the inventor terms a NanoBrowser 43 sends commands entered at computer 13 over link 15 to Proxy-Server 19 and accepts data from Proxy-Server 19 to be displayed on display 33. Data is transferred in a protocol the inventor terms HT-Lite. The NanoBrowser also provides for interactive selection of links and entry into fields in displays, as is typical for WEB pages displayed on a computer screen. The NanoBrowser provides for accepting such entry, packaging such packets in TCP/IP form, and forwarding such data to Proxy-Server 19, where much greater computer power provides for efficient processing.
>
> * * *
> **One of the processing tasks that has to conventionally occur at the browser's computer is processing of received data into a format to be displayed on whatever display the user has.**
> * * *
>
> **To practice the invention, given an accessible WEB server configured as a Proxy-Server according to an embodiment of the present invention, one needs only to load HT-Lite NanoBrowser software on a computer * * *.**
>
> **One of the components of the HT-Lite NanoBrowser software is a minimum browser routine termed by the inventor a NanoBrowser. The NanoBrowser is capable of exerting a URL over the modem connection to access the Proxy-Server. Theoretically, one could exert a URL of a WEB site other than the Proxy-Server, but the result would be an unusable connection, as the small hand-held unit would not be able to handle the sophisticated data provided to be downloaded.**

14

*Kikinis*, Col. 6, line 48- Col. 8, line 41. (Emphasis added). As argued in the summary of the interview, *Kikinis* cannot function without a browser program running on the client device, whereas the instant claims run the client-side applications (such as a browser) on the server and the client is a remote display device for display virtualization. Claims 1, 16 or 30 are therefore not anticipated or rendered obvious in light of *Kikinis* or *Kikinis* in combination with any other reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims are believed to be patentable as being dependent on claims that are believed to be patentable in accord with the arguments presented above.

### Conclusion

All pending claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art. In light of the arguments, an early allowance is requested. No fee is due with this response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 28, 2008

S/Naren Chaganti      (44,602)
Naren Chaganti
713 The Hamptons Lane,
Town & Country, MO 63017
(650) 248-7011 phone

Attorney for the Applicant